



### A HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE.

*A History of Architecture. By Russell Sturgis and A. L. Frothingham. Vol. III: Gothic in Italy, France and Northern Europe. Vol. IV: Gothic in Great Britain; Renaissance; Modern Architecture. La. 8vo. New York, 1915. 25s. net each vol. [Doubleday, Page & Co., New York; London Agents, B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 94 High Holborn.]*

THE late Mr. Russell Sturgis had intended to write a comprehensive history of architecture down to the present day, but only lived to finish the first two volumes. The two handsome volumes now issued complete the work. Mr. Frothingham deals with the rise and development of Gothic in France, southern and northern Europe; and proceeds in the fourth and concluding volume to a study of Gothic in Great Britain, the Renaissance and modern architecture. A universal history of architecture is a stupendous subject, and the man who sets out to write it must possess dogged industry, first-hand knowledge both of the science and art of architecture, rare powers of selection and classification, and, if his work is to be readable, more literary skill than is usually possessed by working artists. Architecture differs from the other arts in that, though it is perfectly free in regard to individual expression, it is subject to the laws of statics and dynamics, and to practical conditions which differentiate it from arts whose sole and essential function is the expression of emotion. Ruskin, for example, most eloquent and suggestive in dealing with the art of painting, became a merely exasperating moralist in dealing with architecture, because all he saw in it was its detail, and he was wholly ignorant of building. Viollet-le-Duc, on the other hand, built up a vast hypothesis of "scientific" construction as shewn in mediæval architecture on an extremely limited basis of facts. Fergusson's work was far more solid, but he had peculiar views, and though his criticisms were often shrewd, his style was arid and unattractive, and he was not a practising architect. The nearest approach to a scientific History of Architecture is that written by the late Auguste Choisy, an extremely able work, but, it must be confessed, terribly stiff reading. The pitfalls that lie in wait for the historian of architecture are sentimentalism and the wrong sort of archæology, or on the other hand a too rigid scientific method which overlooks the essential fact that, whatever the laws which govern its technique, architecture is an intensely individual art for those who have the eyes to see it.

Mr. Frothingham's account of French Gothic is very complete—nearly all the important churches of France are illustrated by photographs and diagrams from Viollet-le-Duc, Choisy, and others. He brings us along through the gradual developments of detail, vaulting, fenestration, piers, and so on; the illustrations are well selected and clearly explained, for Mr. Frothingham possesses a lucid and readable style, and the attentive student can easily follow the thread of his argument. There are, however, some material points on which some of us will differ from him. He holds strongly to the "scientific" point of view in regard to Gothic architecture—that is, he believes that the Gothic builders worked on conscious, deliberate, and considered lines, and that the basis of Gothic was "mathematical." He believes that Gothic architecture had "a canon of building proportion just as

truly as Greek sculpture," and for this he relies on Mr. Goodyear's photographs and researches in certain optical refinements of French Gothic and other evidence as to the use of the triangle and the circle; indeed, he need have gone no further than plates 35, 37 and 42 in the Album of Villard de Honnecourt (reproduction) for evidence that mediæval artists often amused themselves with the application of these rudimentary diagrams to the human figure and to buildings. In Fra Giocondo's edition of Vitruvius (1510 and 1513), book 3, figures are shewn in squares and circles, and in Albert Durer's treatise on the symmetry of the human figure various methods of setting it out geometrically are given; indeed, it was a favourite amusement of ingenious and speculative persons of the time. But evidence such as this by no means warrants the theory that mediæval builders set out their buildings on "a mathematical basis," or, in fact, proceeded on any other methods than those of highly trained and experienced masons, who passed on their traditions of workmanship from father to son. Mr. Frothingham, speaking of Beauvais, says it is "quite clear that its instability was not due to any carelessness, or lack of scientific knowledge on the part of the architect"; but in his next sentence he supplies the answer to his own assertion: "It was necessary for someone to experiment in order to determine the limit of safety; the architect cast himself into the breach for the sake of his art." But if the architect had possessed exact scientific knowledge of the precise thrust of his vaulting, he could have calculated his counterpoise to an ounce; there would have been no need for an experiment at all. Beauvais, in fact, is the irrefutable proof that the mediæval builders, skilful as they were, did not in fact possess scientific knowledge of building. In earlier Gothic they allowed an ample margin of strength, or factor of safety, as we should call it. But as the skill of the masons in stone cutting advanced, they came to rely on it alone, and their consummate stonecraft ended in the catastrophe of Beauvais. The French master-masons (whom Mr. Frothingham persists in calling architects, when they were in fact builders) in the fifteenth century were perhaps the finest stone-cutters there have ever been; but it is against the facts of history and of their actual buildings to credit them with scientific knowledge of building. Martin Chambiges, whom Mr. Frothingham styles "architect of important works of this age" (late fifteenth century), is a case in point. He was called in at Beauvais in 1506, but his work did not stand fifty years, for the date on the south transept window is 1550, and on the first bay of the choir, east of the crossing, 1575.\* Mr. Frothingham describes a highly interesting discovery of the original model of the Church of St. Maclou at Rouen, but I am unable to find the plate of it to which he refers.

His account of domestic architecture in France is less complete than that of ecclesiastical. I find no mention of such very complete and typical houses as Martainville (1483), or the Manoir d'Ango, near Dieppe; and too great reliance has been placed on Viollet-le-Duc's restorations. There is a certain metallic wiry quality about these drawings, what Americans might call "slickness," which leaves those who have studied these old buildings on the spot quite unconvinced. Mr. Frothingham's survey of Gothic in Spain, Portugal, and Italy is able, though of necessity somewhat cursory. He hardly does justice to the striking effects of light and shade attained in some of the Spanish cathedrals, such as Barcelona; but in all these countries Gothic architecture, as compared with that of France, always seems derivative, and spoilt in the derivation. This is particularly the case in Germany, where infinite ingenuity fails entirely as a substitute for genius. Mr. Frothingham does much less than justice to the Gothic of the Netherlands, and more particularly of Holland. There are few finer Gothic towers anywhere than that of the great church at Veere; and the tower of Leeuwarden Church, a splendid solitary fragment of the fourteenth century, will compare, both in its mass and its crispness of detail, with any tower of the same date in France or anywhere else.

Mr. Frothingham's appreciation of English Gothic is sane and level-headed. He sums it up in

---

\* I have discussed the question of the master-builders at length in Vol. I, Chap. 2 of my *History of French Architecture*.—R. B.

the opening sentence of his second volume: "An exceptional position is taken by England. She is a splendid second to France in the race for honour, leaving other countries hopelessly distanced," and he points out that England worked out her Gothic her own way and as her own expression of herself. He does not appear, however, to have studied our most learned authorities on the subject, such as Willis among the older writers and Professor Prior among contemporaries; and his concluding remark in reference to military architecture, that its interest is "more historic than artistic," will seem somewhat unfortunate to those who regard architecture as the art of building.

Mr. Frothingham's transition from Mediæval Architecture to Renaissance is somewhat abrupt and unsatisfactory. Except in Italy, it was far more gradual and tentative than is generally supposed. In Italy the change was due to two causes, the Italian instinct for Classic rather than for Gothic, and far more to a factor of world-wide importance, to which Mr. Frothingham scarcely refers, the influence of the Humanists. From Alberti to Michelangelo, all the great Italian architects were intensely keen students of the remains of ancient Rome. They very ably interpreted the ideals of such men as Politian, Pico della Mirandola, and Lorenzo di Medici; and the more one studies their works the more one realises how completely they were steeped in the study of antiquity. From Italy this enthusiasm spread to other countries, notably to France, and, finally, to England. In both the latter countries the Gothic instinct was deep-rooted and tenacious, but the master-masons had fallen from their high estate, they had lost their cunning and had become merely unscrupulous tradesmen. De l'Orme was unmeasured in his denunciations of their incompetence, and Mr. Frothingham is wrong when he denies that the Renaissance in France was due to the final impotence of Gothic. Whether one liked it or not, a change was inevitable under the altered conditions of life. Mr. Frothingham's account of the Italian Renaissance is interesting and very fully illustrated, but lacks clearness. It is difficult to see the wood for the trees, and in a very complex subject such as this it is better to lay down broadly the main lines with a few well-selected instances to illustrate the principle of classification, rather than to attempt to include all the famous buildings and all the known architects. I find the same difficulty in the account of the Renaissance in France. Here we have details of ornament of every kind, but very little about architecture; and the arrangement of the illustrations is somewhat confused, a seventeenth-century portico (wrongly described as Barocco), at the Hôtel de Caulet at Toulouse, suddenly appears among sixteenth-century details; and Chambiges appears in the company of Bullant and De l'Orme. Nor is the account of Martellange and of the rise of Jesuit architecture in France at all accurate. Its origin and development in France is quite different from what is suggested in Mr. Frothingham's very summary reference; and to find the barbarous design of the Hôtel de Ville of La Rochelle described as "a splendid piece of Barocco" under Henri IV is, to say the least, bewildering. The building was begun under Henri II, it is not Barocco, nor does it at all represent the characteristic architecture of Henri IV. It was just an ambitious attempt of some sixteenth-century designer to catch the fashionable manner somehow. (I may mention that it was restored with ferocious thoroughness by Lisch about forty years ago.)

But my most serious criticism of Mr. Frothingham's history is that he appears to me to have entirely missed the meaning of Renaissance architecture as handled by the French, and, indeed, by other people; for he regards the Renaissance as an isolated chapter of architecture which began in the sixteenth and ended in the seventeenth century, instead of treating it as merely the opening chapter of a vast and far-reaching change in the orientation of architecture. The Renaissance of which Mr. Frothingham treats was, in fact, the first tentative effort in a movement which was ultimately to develop into that splendid architecture which gives us Maisons and the Invalides in France, St. Paul's, Greenwich, and Hampton Court in England, and many other noble buildings throughout Europe. That movement went on steadily in France down to the French Revolution, and in England till the rise of the Romantic movement, and in spite of the aberrations of the nineteenth century it is still vital to-day

It is impossible to understand rightly the various phases of development of modern architecture unless this one essential historical fact is clearly grasped.

Mr. Frothingham's failure to grasp it vitiates all his criticism of Renaissance architecture, and indeed his critical judgment seems somewhat uncertain. He classifies as related buildings of different architectural intentions, and while he commends the sprawling portico of Sta. Maria della Grazie at Arezzo with its very badly proportioned order and fragments of entablature above the columns, he condemns the façade of the Redentore at Venice, about the best thing of its kind in Italy. Nor is he to be relied on for his facts. He says that "Gilles le Breton is responsible for a large part of the work at Fontainebleau between 1527 and 1552," and appears to rank him with that fine architect Jean Bullant. Mr. Frothingham is not aware that Gilles le Breton was contractor for the masonry at Fontainebleau, and that full entries to him for payments for this work are to be found in the "Comptes des Bâtimens du Roi" (1528-1571); further, that he did his work so badly that when De l'Orme took charge of Fontainebleau, in 1548, he found that the water leaked through the vaulting of the chapel, owing to Le Breton's bad workmanship,\* and in his famous "Instruction" De l'Orme says: "Combien de ruines et perilz fussent advenus au diet Fontayne de bleau sans moi, et à la grande gallerye." As for the Grande Salle du Bal, of which Mr. Frothingham gives a very bad illustration from Sadoux, De l'Orme says that when he took it in hand it was falling to pieces. It had only been built ten years before.

Nor is Mr. Frothingham's account of Renaissance architecture in England any happier. His description of St. Paul's is simply unintelligible. Of Wren's first design he says: "Wren first planned it as a concentric structure with a central dome on eight piers surrounded by eight smaller domes." If I may quote myself, Wren's "rejected design, roughly speaking, consisted of a square, 300 feet by 300 feet, with the four angles cut off on a quadrant described from the four points of the square. Over the central space there was to be a dome of 120 feet diameter, and 180 feet high from the floor, with four smaller domes at the N.E., S.E., N.W. and S.W. angles, of 45 feet diameter."† Mr. Frothingham makes no reference to the beautiful model now in St. Paul's and seems quite unaware of the existence of Wren's immense iron chain round the base of the inner cone. It is a pity that when our American friends write about English architecture they do not study it a little more closely.

Mr. Frothingham's volumes are well turned out, but too heavy to handle easily owing to the use of the paper required for reproduction of the photographs. There are literally hundreds of these, but no plans or sections by the author himself, and though Choisy's favourite isometrical projections look very well, they are less trustworthy and less instructive to an architect than plans and sections to scale. Throughout the two volumes no attempt whatever has been made at documentation, not a single authority is cited in the text, and there is not even a list of authorities consulted. For the purposes of scholars the book is deprived thereby of quite half its value. I come reluctantly to the conclusion that "a History of Architecture" has yet to be written—and I greatly doubt if it ever will be.

REGINALD BLOMFIELD [F.].

\* De l'Orme, *Architecture*, p. 300.

† Reginald Blomfield, *A History of Renaissance Architecture in England, 1500-1800*, I., 166.





## CLASSIC VINTAGE.

HERE is a nice question suitable for inclusion in an Examination Paper: "By what ancient Corporation was the following resolution passed: 'That it is the opinion of the Society that Avignon is in Italy.' How long did it survive this expression of opinion, and what distinguished men, if any, were its members?"

The answer, correctly given, is as remarkable as the question. The body of *savants* who came to this irregular conclusion lived on merrily for 146 years, and is at the present time full of cultured vitality. The amusing resolution in question was backed by another: "That no other town in France is in Italy," and the two bear no special allusion—though one might expect it—to the long residence of the Popes at Avignon. The intention of the two sentiments thus voted was to overcome in the case of "the Hon. Captain Edgecumbe" a standing rule of the Society that no one should be admitted a member who had not sojourned in Italy. This was in the year 1746-7. Eight years later the same restrictions were again felt to be onerous and, rather than turn the map of Europe inside out, the standing rule was modified so as to admit to qualification those who had visited Italy "or some other classic ground out of the King's dominions." But the treading of classic soil was not the only qualification. Good birth and good fellowship (prandial and post-prandial) were essential, if unwritten, requirements of the earlier members of this studious brotherhood. It has contained during its career some of the most nobly born, the most learned, and the most convivial members of England's best society. The powers of drinking deeply and thinking wisely have not always been combined in equal degrees in individual members. At the present day it is hardly to be expected that the *personnel* should rise to the after-dinner standards of the mid-eighteenth century. The high-water mark (or should one say high-wine mark) has fallen, but there still floats upon the neap tide of modern moderation a company of merry-makers which, if it falls short of its predecessors in bravery with the bottle, can well hold its own in birth, brains and ability.

Look at the names of members in the present and the recent past. The Warden of All Souls is companioned by more than one of his College Fellows. A Director of the Bank of England is coupled with a Director of the British Museum. A President of the Board of Agriculture there has met a President of the Probate, Divorce and Admiralty Division as well as Presidents of the Royal Academy and the Alpine Club. Professors are in the list, Slade Professors of

Art, and Regius Professors of Greek and History. Consuls, Ambassadors are there, and even Viceroy. Attorneys-General are, one might say, frequent, and Judges more than frequent. Among them all are many of those names which stand simultaneously in England for the highest of nobility and the deepest of cultured knowledge. In fact, it is not too much to say that the names of which the roll of members is composed represent a carefully-chosen gathering together of men who are known, men who know, and men who are noble. All of them come into two of these categories, many into all three.

If the once respectable and well-understood word *dilettante* were not now obsolete and somewhat perverted from its earlier use I should call them dilettanti—and this is, in fact, exactly what they are called.

When in the eighteenth century it became fashionable for young men of good family to complete their education by a grand tour in Italy, it was at least natural that their common interest in a shared occupation should lead to the formation of a club, and that this club should be exclusive in the sense that none was to be admitted to it who was not qualified both by social status and by participation in the pursuit of what one may call classic travel. The club at its outset was, in harmony with the spirit of the age, frankly and generally convivial; and if some of its earlier members were almost better known to the world at large by their escapades than by their learning, it is perhaps because a man's outbreaks of human nature make more stir than the secret stores of *literæ humaniores* in his brain. To be quite just to the desperadoes of those early days it must be acknowledged that even the horribly licentious and profane Sir Francis Dashwood was a generous supporter, "both by counsel and money," of the serious work of the body which he helped to found, and that even if their business meetings were orgies, their orgies were business meetings. In fact, this is the truest way of expressing their activities. It was, so to speak, a necessary element in their life as decent members of society that they should meet in carousal about once a month, and they agreed together that their monthly exercise with the bottle should be accompanied by and centred upon the promotion of classical and artistic studies. The extent of their services to archæology, painting, architecture and sculpture is greater than I can chronicle here, but to us in this Institute there stands out conspicuous one of their labours which may probably be regarded as their central and crowning achievement. It cannot, it is true, be classed chronologically as the work of their most boisterous epoch, but if it occurred in the

age when drinking was rather a pastime than a pursuit, it none the less was in direct continuation of the line of research which had been initiated, fostered, and generously encouraged by the accomplished *viveurs* of the Society's birth-era.

In the year 1839 there strode into Cambridge a tall, long-limbed undergraduate, a youth of keen brain and great physical strength, to whom work was play and play was desperately easy. His great limbs and strong sinews found a welcome in the Magdalene Eight (as well as in that of the University), and his spare energies in the intellectual and physical spheres sought opportunity in such trifles as the study of astronomy or a brisk walk to London. He was a descendant from the family of the martyred Cranmer, and his personality, oddly enough, was known to all good children of my generation under the gentle pseudonym of "Mary," for he was the origin of the child-questioner of that name in Mrs. Markham's catechetical *History of England*. His mother, in fact, was "Mrs. Markham," and Mary was no other than Francis Cranmer Penrose, architect, archæologist, and astronomer, to whom we owe the elucidation of the Parthenon, the custody for many years of St. Paul's Cathedral, and one of the most splendid portraits that ever grew under the magic brush of Sargent. To all who ever knew Penrose that square of coloured canvas in our Common Room at Conduit Street is not merely a priceless work of art, but a living memorial of one of the most kindly and modest men that ever concealed a European importance under a countenance of unassuming tenderness. Dear old Penrose.

But to return to young Penrose. Before he went to Cambridge he had been four years in the office of Edward Blore, and at some period or other before he received his degree (as tenth senior optime) he had taken water-colour lessons from the great Peter de Wint, so that by the time he had finished, in 1845, the architectural tour which he undertook as "Traveling Bachelor" of the University he was singularly well equipped for any task requiring such various faculties as accuracy, architectural and mathematical knowledge, effective draughtsmanship, and strong physique.

The Society of Dilettanti were looking for a man "to test Pennethorne's theories as to the measurements of Greek classical buildings." That such a man of twenty-eight, as Penrose then was, should be available was miraculous.

Of his work I need not here speak. All of us know his famous book which appeared under the auspices of the Society in 1847, and again in 1851; but it is of interest to note that he was made a member in 1852,

and forty-five years afterwards was the "father" of the Society.

Closely connected with the good work of Penrose among the Dilettanti was the encouragement afforded by them to (Sir) Charles Newton, who "entered into relations" with the Society in 1854. Newton was then starting on his famous exhumation of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, and we find him reporting progress in 1857. It was felt at that period that some architect should be sent out to assist in the work. Penrose had Pullan "up his sleeve" for the purpose, and was on the eve of recommending the Society to appoint and endow him when intelligence was received that the Government had spared them the expense by selecting and despatching the very same nominee.

In 1860 the Society brought further honour to itself, and further knowledge to the world, by fostering Cockerell's researches at Ægina and Bassæ.

It is proper to make mention here of certain friendly relations between the Society and our Institute in more recent times. In searching through their documents the Secretaries (and a special committee) of the Society discovered a few years ago a large number of spare impressions of plates prepared for past publications. These they generously distributed among certain Institutions, and to our share was added "a residuum of fine architectural plates with the original drawings."

We were sufficiently proud of this gift to hold in 1912 an exhibition, and in preparing a descriptive account Professor Lethaby made the discovery that some threescore of these plates had, as a matter of fact, never been published. The suggestion that they should be issued was readily accepted, and our Institute was permitted to join the Society as a joint-sponsor on the guarantee fund.

Some enquiries made in connection with this publication led to the very kindly presentation, through Mr. George Macmillan, of a copy of the book of which this article is a kind of review. It is a fine volume worthy of the Society; and any of our members who ask for it at the Library will be delighted by the good reproductions of the famous portraits and portrait groups which it contains. The chief of these are two noble pictures painted by Reynolds in 1779, each containing the presentment of seven members of the Society. There are also a good representation of Reynolds by himself, and some very spirited portraits by George Knapp.

The book itself is the compilation of Mr. Lionel Cust, under the editorship of Sir Sidney Colvin, and the supplemental pages are due to Mr. George Macmillan.

Truly the history of this long-lived Society is

remarkable. Every lover of the classic tradition in architecture should be grateful to those gay spirits of the century before last who brought to bear on the great work of classic discovery their wits, their wealth, and their influence. PAUL WATERHOUSE [F.].

## DESIGNS FOR WAR MEMORIALS.

The first year of organisation on the part of the Civic Arts Association resulted in the recent exhibition of War Memorial designs held in the Galleries of the Royal Institute. Nearly four hundred works were submitted in competition for the specified classes, but unfortunately limited space admitted of only a small number of selected works being shown. The Association, it must be explained, owes its origin to the far-seeing policy of the Hon. R. B. Kay-Shuttleworth, who early in the war collaborated with a number of artists to found a society whose chief aim would be to act in an advisory capacity to those of the public desiring to erect memorials to their dead. In addition it was recognised that the ambitious title Civic Arts embraced practically every subject bearing upon the problems of social amenity and artistic expression, a decision arrived at through the wisdom and eloquence of Professor Lethaby. The Executive Committee of the Association have the desire to augment the aspirations of other established bodies, not only in the furtherance of artistic achievement, but more particularly regarding the interests of artists, and hope to extend the scope of their operations to soil that has remained uncultivated. The need of an organised body of artists genuinely interested in the problems arising out of the Great War is urgent. The movement in which the Association is the pioneer is as yet in its initial stages, the machinery far from perfect, the conditions seemingly overwhelming; yet the fact that a jury of responsible men, representing all sections of the sphere of art, has agreed to work in an executive capacity is an inspiring innovation with vast possibilities. The Association having organised itself, and having discussed all the conditions it would be called upon to meet, resolved to inaugurate a competition which would serve two distinct purposes: first, to assist those artists and craftsmen whom the war has seriously affected; and secondly, to enquire into, as well as to make discoveries regarding the nature of war memorials suitable for every purse. In time the scope of the Association might well be enlarged from its present advisory capacity to one in which it might exercise control in the design of monuments and their public setting.

Judging from the results of the first competition it cannot be said that artistic expression of to-day is ideal, although certain healthy signs are noticeable. There are apparently three distinct tendencies, groups, or schools in existence, which can be classed as follows: the Arts and Crafts movement; the intellectual coterie, with predilections for the teachings of Rodin and

Mestrovic; and the traditional school, which is unfortunately in the minority. Signs are not lacking that the first two groups have a common unity and sympathy, and practically unite forces in opposition to those who pin their faith to the standard of tradition. This is regrettable, but it is without doubt due to the amateurs in artistic matters possessing a smattering of knowledge and acting as direct patrons to craftsmen, the lack of a general standard of taste, and the disturbing influence of fashion.

The traditional school, which to architects is the most important, has many obstacles to overcome before it regains its once-honoured status. Its exponents are conservative of the old methods, but are keenly alive to modern thought and prefer to advance with circumspection. Notwithstanding such conflicting theories and apparent diversity of purpose among the competing artists, through the agency of the present competition several discoveries have been made. It is a well-merited triumph for the traditional school that the most important prize should have been awarded to an architect and a sculptor whose conjoint production is based on tradition. The group of sculpture flanked by trophies of war submitted by Mr. E. A. Rickards and Mr. Henry Poole, and awarded the first prize, is indubitably the best on exhibition. The second award was secured by Mr. Eric Gill and Mr. Charles Holden. This design is of quasi-religious character; its symbolical meaning has little reference to the war, but, on the contrary, aims at high moral significance. Mr. Eric Gill is a recognised theorist of the intellectual group which is at present fashionable; he aims at originality based on archaic simplicity, but he should have recognised that the legend of our Lord driving the money-changers from the Temple is too sublime to suffer translation into material terms.

The design by Mr. Alan Wyon and Mr. Stanley Ramsey, awarded the third prize, is an example of modern classic imperfectly worked out, although, considered as an idea, the conception is striking. Mr. Ramsey is well known for his theories regarding the best French models of similar character, and it is all the more regrettable that the sculptor did not rise to the occasion in the design of the figure surmounting the pedestal.

Regarding the wall tablets submitted in the various classes, these are far from convincing, although in some instances remarkable for good inscriptions and excellent lettering. The tastes of the artists vary from traditional Renaissance motifs to designs of pronounced Egyptian and Hellenic ancestry.

Mr. Eric Bradbury was awarded the first prize for a mural tablet in bronze, the design of which falls in the latter category. Mr. Eden's novel design for a carved wood tablet is an example of rich and ingenious complexity, recalling the naturalistic conventions of Grinling Gibbons transposed to terms of Gothic.

The designs submitted in the class for a Village Fountain vary considerably in expression. Mr. Cyril Farey's conception appears more suited to a vast garden than to the simplicity of a village green, and

the architectural treatment is laboured and self-conscious. Other designs show sympathy for lych-gates, seventeenth-century penthouses, and rude stone horse-troughs.

Among the lesser memorials for the home the medal stands designed by Mr. Arthur Stratton are the most distinguished, and reveal legitimacy of purpose and sound scholarship. It is a pity that the claims of tradition in this particular regard were overlooked by the jury in favour of the lesser importance of craftsmanship as displayed in the design of inlaid boxes, illuminated lettering, etc.

To sum up the results of the competition, it must be stated that the Teutonic reaction, especially of the Munich School, is very much in evidence in the majority of the designs and paintings; much of the sculpture is affected and lacking in decorative interest, and the necessity for a school of fresco painters is more than urgent. Regarding those designs in which architecture and sculpture predominate it is interesting to note how the architects and sculptors following Continental precedent have worked together to produce unity of effect. This is especially so in the case of the winning design.

The Civic Arts Association did not expect to receive standardised designs ready for use, for their primary object, as stated before, was to make discoveries and bring the necessitous artist into direct touch with the patron. The fact that the movement has been well received in the provinces and that the sympathies of local authorities throughout the country have been invoked is of good augury, for the future holds many awkward problems in store.

A. E. RICHARDSON [F.].

#### ON INSCRIPTIONS AND WAR MEMORIALS.

*On Inscriptions.* By Eric Maclagan. 8vo, 16pp.

*On War Memorials.* By A. Clutton-Brock. 8vo, 12pp.

Both published at 3d. by the Civic Arts Association. 1916.

The two tracts issued by the Civic Arts Association should be in the hands of all architects and craftsmen. They were on sale at the exhibition of the competition designs for war-memorials at 9, Conduit Street, and will, no doubt, receive a wide publicity.

That such tracts and such an exhibition were deemed necessary is, however, a definite slur on the taste of our people. One may hunt in vain through old-time literature for any suggestion on the subject of inscriptions from the design point-of-view. Why? Because, from Greek times, such matters were instinctive with all the old craftsmen, and it was not until the end of the eighteenth century that it became unsafe to entrust a good workman with a simple tablet *in memoriam*. Charm and a general sense of good proportion were, before this time, the natural attributes to the work of a good craftsman. He required no instruction. To-day it is different. As a nation we have allowed our traditions to sleep, and it is to arouse our national instinct that such tracts and such an exhibition are necessary. But, as these tracts have

the imprimatur, although possibly in the nature of individual opinions, of an Association doing excellent work, I would cavil at certain matters.

In the memorial-tract the author, well knowing that our people have lost this old instinct, says: "The first necessity is that our war memorials should take the form of something that we ourselves like, not of something that we suppose we might like if we were artists. We must set the artist to make what we like as well as he can, not to produce something artistic. This blind submission of ours to the artist has made it impossible for us to distinguish the good artist from the bad." In the first place, there is no such thing as a bad artist. Men who design badly proportioned letters, badly spaced in their setting, or out-of-scale in relation to their site, are not artists, however well they may paint, draw, carve, or sketch technically. Designs containing the above defects are approved daily by the public because they know no better. The old instinct sleeps. It must be awakened. It is, therefore, unwise to let the man who "knows what he likes" have what he likes, at the present time, as a broad principle. His taste is almost certain to be defective.

It is to guide folks into saner ways in art that this Exhibition is of real value. Here the public, at no cost, may see an interesting set of designs, generally well judged as to their places in the various classes of competition. There is decidedly little of that deliberate originality of ugliness which unfortunately characterises much of the so-called art of to-day. It would be well, therefore, if a sixpenny or shilling book of the designs were issued at once. To these might be added a supplement of, say, fifty designs of good memorials erected during the last twenty-five years. For such things do exist. Then, gradually, the taste of the "man-in-the-street" would grow into being a help rather than a thing to fight against, as it is to-day.

My second cavil is against the undercurrent of disapproval of the Gothic styles, partly because they are Gothic and partly because inscriptions therein are supposed to be illegible. It is unfortunate that the one good Gothic memorial in the Exhibition, in itself a charming composition, should be marred by badly drawn lettering, which makes this alphabet look much less eligible than it would be in the actual work. I am not aware if many Gothic designs were submitted, but it is unfair, obviously, to condemn Gothic from this one example, and I could wish that other good examples had been shown.

Durer (my edition is Paris, 1535), in his delightful *Geometriae*, Book 3, gives a fine bold Roman type, showing exactly how these letters are set out, and, by little peculiarities of his own, he has invested this type with a Renaissance feeling. But—a point carefully ignored by runners-down of Gothic—he also gives a perfectly legible Gothic alphabet equally well set out. Let us, therefore, hear no more of this vulgar criticism which carps at Gothic. There is room for all good styles in their proper place. I hold no brief for any. But why is it that the detractors of Gothic have no hesitation in putting neo-Greek, Renaissance,



Roman and other lettering in Gothic buildings when they would condemn unhesitatingly a Gothic inscription placed in any other building than a Gothic one? Without doubt they do this partly because of a predilection in favour of anything but Gothic and partly on the score of illegibility.

Here we are up against certain principles which require careful consideration and analysis. One can understand the type of architect who cuts his name on his building—*en passant*, I may say that I do not recall to mind a fine building on which the architect has thought fit to advertise thus its parentage—designing a memorial inscription as self-assertive as “JOHN SMITH, JEWELLER,” over a shop. But surely we should remember that the more important the building is on which an inscription is placed, and the more general the interest of the party or parties in memory of whom a memorial is erected, the more legible should be the inscription. This fetish of legibility should, however, not be carried to excess in private, or semi-private, memorials. Is there not a certain sense of delicacy which would guide us into designing such a memorial with some reticence, even obscurity, without losing any sense of art? I would, therefore, put in a strong plea for the smaller memorials in our churches, of a more or less private nature, to be designed in some variant of Gothic, and, for the sake of terseness, that the inscription may be in Latin.

Finally, I would recommend, as probably the best book (not excepting the two new ones just issued by Mr. Weaver and Mr. Batsford) on memorials, that by Messrs. Brindley & Weatherly, *Ancient Sepulchral Monuments*, folio, 1887. Here will be found innumerable examples of monuments having inscriptions both legible and obscure, in every style, except the “over-precious” ones of modern invention, all beautifully drawn.

Also there are hundreds of well-set-out inscriptions in Latin in a little-known work, *Inscriptiones Sacrosanctae Vetustatis*, etc., folio: Ingolstadii in Aedibus P. Apiani, 1534. This book was published at the expense of Raymond Fugger, to whom it is dedicated, and it is printed in a pleasant broad Roman type, which, as far as I know, has not been reproduced nor used for lettering. As this book is not in the R.I.B.A. Library, I am offering it to the Committee on loan for a while.

P. A. ROBSON [F.].

#### MURAL MONUMENTS AND TOMBSTONES.

*English Mural Monuments and Tombstones: A Collection of Eighty-four Photographs of Wall Tablets, Table Tombs, and Headstones of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, selected by Herbert Batsford. With Introduction by Walter H. Godfrey, F.S.A. Cr. 8vo. Lond. 1916. 12s. 6d. net. [B. T. Batsford, Ltd.]*

Mr. Herbert Batsford has done excellent service in presenting us with photographs of such a valuable and interesting collection of mural monuments and tombstones. It was very much needed, and has come none too soon, when in these exceptional times so many monuments are being, and will yet be,

erected to the memory of departed relatives and friends. There is something pathetic in the invariable desire to do the best we can, under such circumstances, by way of memorial, and the utter failure and want of good taste that so often attend its execution. If those concerned would only give more careful consideration to the matter, and not leave it entirely in unskilled hands, the results would give far more enduring satisfaction.

In dealing with this subject it is natural that we should review what has been done in the past, and these examples provide us with a considerable variety of monumental works. Mr. Batsford would be the first to admit that amongst the great number that exist he has been obliged to omit many valuable examples. We could have wished for a larger collection than he has given us, and, without being too exacting, we should like to have seen more of a simpler design, like those mural monuments of tablet form often met with in the late Elizabethan period. For internal monuments many of these give the true character of a memorial and provide a most appropriate field for the inscription. Simplicity and directness of purpose are essential features in such matters, and although one would not suggest that any suitable embellishment should be left out, yet the chief merit will generally be in the main architectural outline and the moulded setting.

Good examples are given of the bold, oval shields, surrounded by carved scrollwork; of these the earlier forms are always the most commendable. Some of the later types are complicated with redundant carving and ornament, and are apt to miss that which should be their chief purpose—namely, the avoidance of anything in the way of undue display and meretricious ornament, as well as the feeling of rivalry or competition with existing memorials.

As regards external monuments, interesting as many of the examples given undoubtedly are, when we consider, for instance, the crowded condition of those shown in Plate 57, in Painswick Churchyard, we are almost led to doubt the desirability of the table tomb in our small churchyards, especially in view of the ever increasing population. Where, however, there is ample room they are valuable, and the illustrations supply an excellent basis for good work. This subject suggests the question whether it might not be well in populous districts to establish a Campo Santo, or Loggia, set apart for monuments. However this may be, the consistent and well-ordered tombstone will always furnish an appropriate memorial. In these days when cremation is becoming more common the necessity for cinerary urns of suitable designs must not be forgotten; so the use of the vase in combination with the wall tablet, as well as with the external monument, may be appropriately revived for such purposes.

The choice of marble, chiefly for interior work, and of stone for general use is an essential point. The advantages of good stone are especially seen in the

examples from Painswick, where most of those illustrated remain to this day in excellent condition. Not the least important feature of the memorial is the lettering, which should be clear and boldly cut. A good instance is given on Plate 52 from the Crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral. The necessity for this may be realised from the fact that in after years, for various reasons, many tombstones get neglected, and sometimes all record of historical dates and interest is lost.

One could wish there were some well regulated and uniform system for the supervision of designs in all monuments, either through the diocesan architect or some acknowledged authority, in order to prevent the painful repetition and weak display, especially of white marble, to be seen in every churchyard and burial ground.

With reference to the tombstone, it has been truly

said that there is a demand for better things than the ordinary gravestone of commerce, but it seems to get no response. If a mason possessing real capacity opened a yard and showed a good stock of well-designed and well-lettered tombstones, he would surely get all the best of the trade. The men want to be taken in hand and taught to study the old examples, to learn the value of good outlines and proportions, of solidity, and of graceful, well-spaced, clean, and clear lettering.

Useful suggestions are given on these points in the book under notice, but perhaps more stress might have been put upon the necessity for simplicity of design and treatment in all monumental art. This, however, does not detract in any way from the obligation we are under to Mr. Batsford for this valuable collection of examples.

JAS. WILLIAMS.



9 CONDUIT STREET, LONDON, W., 29th July 1916.

## CHRONICLE.

### The R.I.B.A. Record of Honour: Thirty-second List.

#### *Architects fallen in the War.*

**CORBETT, ALBERT EDWARD [F.]**, Captain, Border Regiment. Killed in action on 1st July.

Captain Corbett was the younger son of the late Mr. Joseph Corbett, for many years Borough Engineer of Salford. He was articled in 1888 to the late Mr. John Brooke, of Manchester, and attended various classes at the Manchester School of Art. From 1896 to 1901 he was assistant to Mr. Allan F. Vigers, of 7 South Square, Gray's Inn, and during this time attended the Royal Academy and Architectural Association Schools and the L.C.C. Arts and Crafts School. He passed the Final Examination in 1896 and was elected Associate of the Institute in 1897. He started practice at 78 Cross Street, Manchester, in 1901, occupying half his time until 1906 as Lecturer in the Manchester School of Architecture. He afterwards became a member of the firm of Woodhouse, Corbett & Dean, of 100 King Street, Manchester. Among important buildings in the design and carrying out of which he had a considerable share are Engineering Works at Brighthouse, Motor Garage in Salford, Young Men's Christian Association premises at Manchester, Offices of the Know Mill Printing Co., etc. He was elected Fellow of the Institute in 1911. The following Papers which he read before the Manchester Society of Architects were published in the Institute JOURNAL: "Modern Domestic Architecture" (JOURNAL R.I.B.A., 9th Jan. 1904) and "Concrete and Concrete Tests" (*ib.*, 12th Nov. 1910).

**CUBEY, JOSEPH BERKELEY [A.]**, Captain, 23rd

Northumberland Fusiliers (4th Tyneside Scottish). Killed in action.

Captain Cubeby served his articles with Mr. J. Walter Hanson, of South Shields, and was for some years a student and worker in connection with the Northern Architectural Association. He was elected an Associate of the Institute in 1908. He was for several years assistant in the office of Mr. A. B. Plummer [F.], and left there to take up an appointment in the Land Valuation Office at Newcastle, which he held until he joined the Army.

**FORD, LAWTON STEPHEN [Student]**, Lieutenant, Queen's Royal West Surrey Regiment. Killed in action in France on 1st July. Aged 26.

Lieut. Ford was the only son of Mr. Lawton Robert Ford [A.], District Surveyor for St. James's, Westminster. After passing the London University Matriculation Examination he entered the Architectural Association Schools, and in 1913 took a high place in the Intermediate Examination and was registered a Student R.I.B.A. He joined as a private in the Army Service Corps Motor Section in the early days of the War, and in April 1915 was granted a commission in the West Surreys and went to France in the following September. His Commanding Officer, Colonel Longbourne, in a letter to the bereaved parents, speaks in high praise of the gallant young officer; on more than one occasion, he says, he noted Lieut. Ford's worth as a leader of men.

**GORDON, DONALD JERVIS [Probationer]**, 2nd Lieut., Border Regiment, son of the late Thomas Gordon [A.]. Killed in action.

**GRIFFIN, DOUGLAS MORLEY [A.]**, 2nd Lieut., King's Liverpool Regiment. Died of wounds. Aged twenty-six.

2nd Lieut. D. M. Griffin was articled to Messrs. Harris & Hobson, of Liverpool, and attended the Liverpool University School of Architecture, passing the Certificate Examination in 1910. Having completed his articles, he became assistant to Mr. Henry Hartley [F.], of Liverpool, and was elected Associate of the Institute in December, 1914.

**GROUND, JOHN KINGSTON [A.]**, 2nd Lieut., 10th Bn. Royal West Kent Regiment. Killed in action.

2nd Lieut. J. K. Ground received his professional education in the Architectural Association Schools and served his articles with Messrs. Forsyth and Maule, afterwards becoming an assistant in their office. He was elected an Associate of the Institute in 1912, and later entered into partnership with Mr. Hubert Bensted [A.] at Maidstone.



WILLIAM HAROLD HILLYER, *Student*.  
Captain, Royal Engineers.  
Killed in action [see p. 261].



JOSEPH BERKELEY CUBEY, *Associate*.  
Captain, 23rd Northumberland Fusiliers  
(4th Tyneside Scottish).  
Killed in action [see p. 290].



LAWTON STEPHEN FORD, *Student*.  
Lieutenant, Queen's Royal West Surrey Regiment.  
Killed in action [see p. 290].



NOEL WAUGH HADWEN, *Associate*.  
Captain, Duke of Wellington's Regiment.  
Killed in action [see p. 292].



**HADWEN, NOËL WAUGH [A.]**, Captain, Duke of Wellington's Regiment. Killed in action in France on 1st July. Aged 30.

Captain Hadwen was the second son of Mr. E. W. Hadwen, of Kelroyd, Triangle, Yorkshire. He was educated at Locker's Park, and afterwards at Harrow. He took up the profession of an architect, and was articled to Mr. Romaine-Walker, afterwards going as an assistant to Mr. Guy Dawber, with whom he was taken into partnership a few years ago. He was elected an Associate of the Institute in 1910.

After the outbreak of war Mr. Hadwen, in September 1914, obtained a commission in the Duke of Wellington's Regiment and went to France in 1915. He was in the engagement at Hill 60 in May of that year and was gas poisoned. As soon as he was well enough he returned to the front and was almost continuously engaged in fighting with his regiment, only to meet his death in action on 1st July.

Mr. Guy Dawber writes:—"In Hadwen the profession has lost one of those modest, unassuming men who in their quiet way exercise much influence for good. I had known him for many years as a charming and cultured man, with that rare gift of making friends of both clients and builders and with all who came into contact with him. He was keenly interested in his work, a brilliant sketcher and painstaking student, and gave great promise of ability in design. Had he been spared he would eventually have done much good work for the Institute." Though not personally acquainted with many architects, those who really knew him will deeply regret his loss.

**SHAPLEY, ALFRED EDWIN [Probationer]**, Lieut., Northumberland Fusiliers, formerly Member of the Northern Architectural Association. Killed in action.

**STOTT, ALFRED EDGAR [Student]**, King's Liverpool Regiment. Died of a gunshot wound at Abbeville on 23rd June.

Mr. Stott passed the Intermediate Examination and became a Student in 1912. He was a pupil of Mr. Joseph Pearce, of Liverpool, who writes: "I should like to place on record a word of appreciation for my old pupil: 'He did his work faithfully and well.'"

**BELL, ERIC NORMAN FRANKLAND**, Captain, Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers. Killed in action.

Captain Bell was a student at the Liverpool University School of Architecture, and was about halfway through his course at the Liverpool School when war broke out. He was among the first to volunteer for service, and went to France last October, when he was put in charge of trench mortar work.

**BENNETT, WALTER J.**, 2nd Lieut., 12th Royal Scots. Killed in action.

2nd Lieut. Bennett served his articles with Mr. Lake Falconer, of Blairgowrie, and afterwards practised at Glasgow and St. Andrews. He went to the front in October last, in the following month was accidentally wounded by the explosion of a hand grenade, and was invalided home. He returned to the front last May.

**BROUGH, J. LINDSAY**, 2nd Lieut., 15th Royal Scots. Killed in action.

**GRAHAM, PERCY G.**, Captain, 16th Northumberland Fusiliers. Killed in action.

Captain Graham was a Member of the Northern Architectural Association, and joined the ranks soon after the outbreak of war. He was the champion swimmer in the North of England, for seven consecutive years holding the Newcastle Corporation Cup, and was also an International polo player.

**LAURENCE, J. L.**, Captain, Royal Scots. Killed in action.

**ROBERTS, REUBEN**, Captain, Army Ordnance Department. Killed in action on 8th July.

Captain Roberts served his articles with Messrs. Lockwood & Sons, of Chester. He joined the Inns of Court O.T.C. in January 1915, and was granted a commission in the Army Ordnance Department. He saw considerable service abroad, and last March was promoted captain and appointed Deputy Assistant Director of Ordnance Supplies.

**VENMORE, J. F.**, Lieut., Royal Welsh Fusiliers. Killed in action. Aged twenty-seven.

Lieut. Venmore studied architecture at the Liverpool University, and was engaged in the architectural profession at Liverpool. On the outbreak of war he enlisted in the 3rd Battalion of the Liverpool "Pals," and received a commission in the Royal Welsh Fusiliers in December 1914. In March last he was awarded the Military Cross for conspicuous bravery.

In deepest sympathy with the parents, the names of the following, sons of members of the Institute, are included in this Record:—

**ATKIN-BERRY, HAROLD HARDING**, Lieut., R.N., third son of Mr. W. H. Atkin-Berry [F.]. Killed in action. Aged twenty-four.

**BOND, CHARLES NESBITT**, Lieut., Adjutant of the Lincoln Regiment, son of Mr. Francis Bond [Hon. A.]. Killed in action. Aged twenty-two.

**PEGG, H. W.**, 2nd Lieut., East Surrey Regiment, youngest son of Mr. H. Carter Pegg [F.]. Died of wounds. Aged nineteen.

**SAXON SNELL, FRANK**, B.A. Cantab., 2nd Lieut., Royal Berkshires, only son of Mr. A. Saxon Snell [F.]. Killed in action. Aged twenty-nine.

**TANNER, E. J. S.**, 2nd Lieut., Machine Gun Corps, fourth son of Sir Henry Tanner [F.]. Killed in action.

#### *Serving with the Forces.*

The following is the Thirty-second List of Members, Licentiates and Students R.I.B.A., serving with the Forces, the total to date being 64 Fellows, 472 Associates, 270 Licentiates, and 282 Students:

#### FELLOW.

Davis, Arthur J.: Staff Lieut., Censors' Dept., B.E.F.

#### ASSOCIATES.

Davies, J. C. G.: 2nd Lieut., 2nd Welsh Brigade, R.F.A.  
 Parker, T. A.: Lieut., Royal Naval Air Service.  
 Pett, H. M.: Royal Engineers.  
 Pearse, G. E.: Lieut., Royal Engineers.  
 Pierce, A. P. Hector: New Zealand Field Artillery.  
 Pigott, R. Mountford: Lieut., Royal Engineers.  
 Rylatt, Walter P.: Royal Garrison Artillery.  
 Santo, V. G.: Royal Engineers.  
 Sawyer, Harold S.: Capt., Brigade Bombing Officer, 14th Mounted Brigade.  
 Sifton, I. T.: 4th Reserve Bn. London Regt. Royal Fusiliers.  
 Simpson, C. H.: Artists' Rifles.  
 Stockton, Russell: Royal Naval Division.  
 Sutton, C. A. L.: Royal Naval Air Service.  
 Thompson, J. Osbert: Royal Engineers.  
 Wardrop, J. H.: Australian Forces.  
 Whincop, W. G.: Royal Garrison Artillery.  
 Wood, A. J.: Royal Engineers.  
 Woollatt, John: Royal Engineers.



## LICENTIATES.

Blackburne-Daniel, George Francis: 2nd Lieut., 6th Bn. Royal Fusiliers.  
 Bull, W. W.: Asst. Divn. Officer, R.E. Services.  
 Kyle, A. W.: 4th Bn. Durham Light Infantry.  
 Ovenden, H.: Royal Garrison Artillery.  
 Palmer, B. H.: Royal Engineers.  
 Peacock, J. H.: Royal Engineers.  
 Salmond, Wm.: Royal Engineers.  
 Sharpe, T. W.: Royal Engineers.  
 Shennan, D.: A.M.C. Training Depot, Canada.  
 Stienlet, P. J.: Royal Navy, Transport Divn.

## STUDENTS.

Beville, J. Geoffrey: 2nd Lieut. Queen's Westminster Rifles.  
 McLachlan, C.: 12th County of London Regt.  
 Stewart, C. B.: King's Own Yorkshire Light Infantry.

## Military Honours.

CULLIFORD, LEONARD ARTHUR [A.], 2nd Lieut., Royal Engineers, 2/3rd London Field Co., B.E.F., France. Awarded the Military Cross.

The Territorial Decoration has been conferred upon the following:—

BAILY, B. E. [F.], Major, 7th Sherwood Foresters (Notts and Derby Regiment).  
 BECKWITH, H. L. [Licentiate], Lieut. Colonel, attached 7th West Yorks Regiment.

## Promotions.

Major V. A. Flower [Licentiate], London Regiment, to be temp. Lt.-Colonel.  
 Lieut. Martin S. Briggs [A.], R.A.M.C., 53rd Sanitary Section, to be Captain. Serving in Egypt.  
 Mr. K. A. Cockrill [A.], to be 2nd Lieut. 15th Bn. Royal Fusiliers.  
 2nd Lieut. C. W. Eaton [A.], 11th Bn. Leicestershire Regt., to be Lieut.  
 2nd Lieut. Cyril A. Farey [Student], Army Service Corps, to be temp. Captain while holding special appointment.  
 Lieut. Bernard Hebblethwaite [A.], R.A.M.C., to be Captain.  
 Mr. S. T. Hennell [A.], to be 2nd Lieut., 20th Bn. Welch Regt.  
 Mr. F. J. Horth [Licentiate], to be Lieut. 2/5th K.L.R.  
 Mr. G. H. Jones [A.], Public School Bn. Royal Fusiliers, to be 2nd Lieut.  
 Gunner G. Gordon Leith [A.], to be 2nd Lieut., R.F.A.  
 Lieut. H. E. Moore [A.], Royal Monmouthshire R.E., to be Captain.  
 2nd Lieut. W. G. Newton [A.], London Regt., to be Adj., with temporary rank of Lieutenant.  
 Cadet Robert W. Pite [Student], O.T.C., to be 2nd Lieut., Royal Engineers.  
 Mr. J. L. Warry [A.], to be 2nd Lieut. 2/8th Bn. Sherwood Foresters.

## Immelman's Conqueror.

Members will note with interest that Lieutenant George Reynolds McCubbin, the youthful airman who vanquished Immelman, the famous Fokker pilot, is the son of a Licentiate of the Institute, Mr. David Aitken McCubbin, of Johannesburg, Architect-in-Chief to the South African Railways. Lieut. McCubbin has since been twice wounded, and is now in hospital in London. It was announced yesterday that the D.S.O. has been conferred upon him "for conspicuous gallantry and skill."

## Charing Cross Station and Bridge.

On the motion for the second reading of the Charing Cross Bridge Bill in the House of Commons on the 3rd July, the Bill was rejected by a majority of 42,—25 voting for, and 67 against the motion. Space admits of only brief reference to the able and interesting speeches delivered in the three hours' debate on the question. The previous history of the measure, the case for its rejection, and the unique town-planning possibilities of the area affected are sufficiently set out in Sir Aston Webb's *Observer* article (reproduced in the last issue of the JOURNAL), in Mr. Davidge's article (JOURNAL, 10th June), in the Petition presented to Parliament by the R.I.B.A. and the London Society (JOURNAL, 24th June), and in Mr. Raffles Davison's Paper "Beautiful London" (JOURNAL, 23rd May 1914).

Sir Walter Essex, who moved the rejection of the Bill, referred to the Instruction passed by the House of Lords that evidence should be taken from the Royal Institute of British Architects, the London Society, and others on the treatment of this important part of London, and mentioned that those bodies had suggested for the consideration of the people of London a higher and a nobler idea. The time had come for doing away with the great excrescence by which the railway was hopelessly cramped and hindered in the full discharge of its duties to the public and by the limitations of the site on which the station is placed. A very much larger and wholly adequate site for the station could be found on the other side of the Thames.

The occasion was marked by the re-entrance into the Commons' debates of Mr. Burns, who spoke with all his old vigour and force. If, he said, we had in this country, as in Germany, Austria, France, or Belgium, a Minister of Arts or an Office of Works vested with the duty and responsibility of guiding Parliament in these matters, this Bill would never have passed the examiners. The architectural profession and the Royal Academy and other bodies were all against it. What, he asked, has made London increasingly a place to which tourists are coming from all parts of the world? It is its cleanliness, its sanitation, its comfort, and in recent years the attractiveness brought about by the enormous expenditure of public bodies. Beauty in a city is not a thing that materialists and cynics can brush lightly aside. It is paid for in solid cash by the people who value natural beauty in a city such as this river affords us, blended with architectural adornments, and the harmonious and symmetrical unity of commerce with civic pride, public taste, and fine public amenities. Mr. Burns recalled that just over a hundred years ago, Wordsworth, standing on old Westminster Bridge, looking in the direction of Waterloo Bridge, without any monstrosity like Charing Cross Bridge to obstruct the view, wrote:

Earth hath not anything to show more fair,  
 Dull would he be of soul who could pass by  
 A sight so touching in its majesty.

Wordsworth would never have written those lines to-day. Constable painted one of his finest pictures from Westminster when he gave us, without Charing Cross Bridge, a splendid picture of that magnificent sweep from Westminster Bridge to Waterloo. Canova, the great Italian artist and sculptor, said that to see a single arch of Waterloo Bridge was worth coming from the remotest corners of the earth. Mr. Burns recalled the proposal by a syndicate some years ago to overwhelm the Houses of Parliament by building a second Hankey's Mansions on the site of the new Garden west of the Victoria Tower.

The Bill to enable this to be done had passed the second reading and had got through the Committee. On that occasion he appealed to the House to accept his guarantee that if they threw out the Bill he would persuade the London County Council to get rid of the wharves and the unsightly premises between Lambeth Bridge and the Houses of Parliament. The House of Commons responded to his appeal and threw out the Bill. And the County Council had kept its word. They had spent a million of money between the Victoria Tower and Lambeth Bridge on a fine garden, a vast embankment, a new road, and they had attracted by that wise expenditure large private corporations to put up some of the handsomest buildings that had been erected in London in the last twenty years. If we could do that for a garden, what ought we not to do to relieve that noble sweep of the Thames from Westminster to Waterloo Bridge from the monstrosity that even a railway company could not defend. He appealed to the House to give Sir Aston Webb, the architects, the Office of Works, the Home Office, and the Board of Trade, in conjunction with the railway company, a chance to come together and discuss the matter in a sane, practical way, without any prejudice to the railway company.

Speakers in favour of the Bill considered the measure justified in view of the evidence brought forward that the bridge was not safe for traffic. Captain Pretymann, on behalf of the Board of Trade, stated that traffic had already to be reduced by 50 per cent. owing to the condition of the bridge, and if the Bill were rejected it would have to be still further curtailed. There was, however, general agreement among all the speakers as to the desirability of shifting the station to the other side of the river.

The Joint Committee of the Institute and the London Society who have so successfully combated the Bill consisted of Sir Aston Webb, R.A., *Chairman*; Mr. Ernest Newton, A.R.A., *President R.I.B.A.*; Mr. Reginald Blomfield, R.A., Professor Beresford Pite, Mr. Paul Waterhouse, Mr. D. Barclay Niven, Professor S. D. Adshead, Mr. T. Raffles Davison, Mr. H. J. Leaning, Mr. Randolph Glen, Mr. Douglas Fox, and Mr. W. R. Davidge, *Hon. Secretary*.

In the *Observer* last Sunday Mr. Edgar Horne, M.P., calls attention to the heavy responsibility which lies on the State, the London County Council, and the Railway Company to move without delay in this matter, and makes the following suggestions:

What is required now is the direction of the initiative and the allotment of the responsibility for the expense.

I would suggest that the railway companies should at once proceed to schedule an area of land on the south side of the river suitable for the erection of a station, its approaches and connections, with the view to an application to Parliament next Session for compulsory powers, and that in this work it should receive the sympathetic co-operation of the London County Council.

Plans for a new station and connecting lines with the existing system on the site so obtained should be drawn up, giving accommodation at least 50 per cent. beyond that enjoyed at the present time at the existing station and its approaches. The construction of this station and of the necessary connections (but not the cost of the land) should be borne by the London County Council, as I am treating this part of the improvement on the lines of a reinstatement scheme. The new station and the approaches would therefore form the contribution of London to the improvement. When the new station and lines are completed and all is ready for traffic the existing station and bridge and the land should be handed over to the London County Council.

So far as the new road bridge is concerned this should be erected at the cost of the State, and when completed should be

handed over to the London County Council, who should be responsible for its upkeep.

So soon as the railway company has given possession of the old station to the London County Council, together with any other land which it has acquired in connection with it, it should receive from the London Council an amount, to have been previously agreed, for the purchase of this land—I suggest that somewhere about £15 a foot would be an equitable price to be fixed. I have no doubt that the London County Council would lose little in this transaction if a proper scheme of development were decided on.

I have now apportioned part of the expense on to the shoulders respectively of the London County Council and of the State, and the question remains as to the contribution to be made by the railway company, who must remember that it is granted very valuable easements and a trading monopoly from the State. The contribution I suggest, therefore, which the railway company should be asked to make is the forgoing of all claims for the loss of profits obtainable from the short length of line abandoned by them. They will obtain, without cost, a new station at least 50 per cent. larger than the present one, constructed on modern lines, and this should be capable of accommodating twice as much traffic as the old station. It should also be remembered that they will be handing over a bridge unable to deal at present with more than 50 per cent. of the traffic it is nominally planned to carry. The economy in working which these alterations will effect and the largely increased profits which will be available for dividends would more than counterbalance the contribution now proposed.

If this scheme is accepted it would be quite feasible to insert a clause in the new Bill authorising the expenditure for strengthening the present structure for its few remaining years of life.

#### Control of Building: Government Restrictions.

The Minister of Munitions has issued the following notice:

In pursuance of the powers conferred upon him by the Defence of the Realm Regulations, the Minister of Munitions has issued the following order:—

On and after the twentieth day of July, 1916, no person shall without licence from the Minister of Munitions commence or carry on any building or construction work—that is to say, the construction, alteration, repair, decoration, or demolition of buildings, or the construction, reconstruction, or alteration of railroads, docks, harbours, canals, embankments, bridges, tunnels, piers, or other works of construction or engineering. Provided that where the total cost of the whole completed work in contemplation does not exceed the sum of £500 and the use of constructional steel is not involved the licence of the Minister of Munitions shall not be required.

Provided also that where the work in question—

(a) is being or is to be carried out by or under contract with any Department of his Majesty's Government, or is declared by any such Department to be a Government contract for the purpose of this Order, or

(b) is being or is to be carried out by or under contract with any local authority which has been authorised by any Government Department since the 25th of March, 1915, to borrow money in respect of such work, the licence of the Minister of Munitions shall not be required.

Provided also that where a first application for a licence under this Order has been made and is pending for the carrying on of work which has been commenced before the said twentieth day of July, 1916, nothing in this Order shall prohibit the carrying on of such work until the licence has been refused.

All persons desirous of obtaining a licence to commence or carry on any building or construction work as above defined for which a licence is required shall apply in writing to the General Secretary, Ministry of Munitions, 6 Whitehall Gardens, S.W., for such licence, and shall give full particulars of the description and locality of the work, the purpose for which it is intended and its estimated cost, and such further information as the Minister may require, and shall comply with any restrictions or conditions subject to which the grant of such licence may be made.

**Sir Rowand Anderson and the Royal Gold Medal.**

Sir R. Rowand Anderson [F.] was the guest of the Architectural Societies of Scotland at a luncheon given in his honour at the Caledonian Station Hotel, Edinburgh, on the 29th ult., to celebrate the distinction conferred upon him as the first Scottish architect to receive the Royal Gold Medal for Architecture [see JOURNAL, 24th June]. Mr. T. F. MacLennan [A.], President of the Edinburgh Architectural Association, occupied the chair. The company numbered about 100, and included Lady Anderson, Lord Provost Sir Robert Inches, Sir John H.A. Macdonald, Sir James Balfour Paul, Sir John J. Burnet [F.], Professor Baldwin Brown [Hon. A.], Sir Robert Lorimer [F.], Rev. Dr. Wallace Williamson, Mr. Paul Waterhouse [F.], and the following croupiers: Messrs. John Watson [F.], Glasgow; Harbourn MacLennan, Aberdeen; and George P.K. Young [F.], Dundee.

Lord Provost Inches handed the Medal to Sir Rowand,\* and read a letter from Sir Aston Webb expressing admiration of Sir Rowand Anderson's work as an architect, and also in the cause of architectural education.

Sir John J. Burnet presented an address of congratulation in the name of the Architectural Societies of Scotland, in which reference was made to the magnificent record of Sir Rowand Anderson's accomplished work, the invaluable services he had rendered to the cause of architectural education, and his devotion to the interests of the profession. Sir John Burnet alluded to Sir Rowand Anderson's great characteristics, his constructive power, his knowledge of the craft, and his high ideals of craftsmanship which he had done much to develop.

The Chairman said they were all proud to show Sir Rowand Anderson's works to admiring strangers as those of an Edinburgh man; they were worthy additions to the architecture of their beautiful city. On behalf of the younger generation he expressed indebtedness to Sir Rowand for his generous and invaluable services in the establishment of sound architectural teaching in Edinburgh for the ideals which inspired him, and for the fight he had made against all shams in misapplied architecture.

Sir Rowand Anderson expressed his gratification at receiving so generous a tribute from his brother architects.

**Arts and Crafts: Scheme for a Great Exhibition.**

The Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society are organizing an exhibition to be opened in the first week of October at Burlington House. A guarantee fund of £1,500 is being formed for the preliminary work, under a finance committee of which Mr. W. Lee Matthews is chairman and Mr. C. H. St. John Hornby, hon. treasurer. The President and Council of the Royal Academy have granted the free use of their galleries. In each room will be constructed temporary interiors, which will be decorated and furnished by different artists. Within these interiors will be arranged individual works selected for their fitness to the scheme of decoration adopted. There will be a large municipal hall, the sides divided into bays, each decorated in harmony with an agreed scheme. Another gallery will be fitted up as an ideal Council Chamber. The central octagon will be divided into a series of apsidal chapels, decorated by individual artists or groups of artists. In the entrance gallery will be constructed a panoramic suggestion for the reconstruction of Trafalgar Square. Mr. E. S. Prior, A.R.A. [F.], 1 Hare-court, Temple, is Hon. Secretary of the Exhibition Society.

\* Sir Rowand, it will be remembered, was not well enough to come to London to be invested with the Medal, and Sir Robert Inches attended and received the Medal on his behalf.

**The Civic Arts Association's Exhibition.**

The Civic Arts Association's Exhibition of Designs for War Memorials was held in one of the Galleries of the R.I.B.A., 9 Conduit Street, W., and was open to the public for twelve days, from the 17th to the 29th inst. H.M. the Queen honoured the Exhibition with a visit on the 19th. The opening ceremony, presided over by Mr. Ernest Newton, A.R.A., President R.I.B.A., was attended by a large and distinguished company, and an address was delivered by Mr. Arthur C. Benson, Master of Magdalene.

Mr. BENSON said we had a task before us to see that the memory of those who had fought and died for us should be as stably and durably commemorated as possible. Our present task was to see that our dead were worthily commemorated for our own sakes and for the sake of those who would come after. We must not do it idly and carelessly—we must take thought of the plan and the purpose, and not be in too great a hurry. What he hoped we should do was to take careful thought where our memorials should be set, so that they might be most constantly and plainly seen; and then how they might best fulfil their purpose. What we wanted were beauty, dignity, simplicity, and force. We wanted what appealed directly to the eye and then darted a strong emotion into the heart. It would be well if some central advisory board could be established, and the nature of the memorials should be carefully scrutinised. Simplicity, naturalness, eloquence of emotion rather than of word would, he hoped, be the notes of our memorials.

The BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD, moving a vote of thanks to Mr. Benson, remarked that they all hoped they would have the assistance and the cordial sympathy of the best hearts and brains that could be brought to bear in this matter when they came to put up their simple memorials in their village churches.

The CHAIRMAN said it was for them to see that the churches and homes of Great Britain were not disfigured by an eruption of "trade" brasses and tablets which would dishonour the memory of our heroes.

Sir CECIL HARCOURT SMITH, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Civic Arts Association, said that about four hundred designs had been received from all parts of the country, and it was hoped that arrangements would be made for sending the exhibits for a short term to important centres in the provinces.

**The following is the list of prizewinners:—**

CLASS I.—Design for the London County Council Staff Memorial.—First prize, £50, E. A. Rickards [F.], and Henry Poole, R.B.S.; second prize, £15, Eric Gill, sculptor, and Charles Holden [A.], architect; prize, £10, Alan Wyon and Stanley Ramsey [A.].

CLASS II.—Design for a Wall Tablet in Cast Bronze.—First prize, £20, Eric Bradbury; second prize, £5, H. P. Gill and R. F. Wilson; prize, £5, Macdonald Gill; book prize, W. A. Robertson.

CLASS III.—Design for a Wall Tablet in Carved Wood.—First prize, £20, Thomas Rayson; second prize, £5, F. C. Eden; book prize, Walter John Brown.

CLASS IV.—Design for a Wall Tablet in Marble or Stone.—First prize £20, Eric Gill; second prize, £5, Alec Miller; book prize, Mrs. Bernard Jenkin.

CLASS V.—Design for a Simple Wall Tablet in Wood.—First prize, £10, Tom Broadbent; second prize, £5, A. E. Martin; book prize, Thomas Rayson.

CLASS VI.—Design for Mural Painting for a Boys' Club.—First prize, £10, Gladys D. Davison; second prize, £5, Miss Elsie McNaught; prize, £5, Miss Lanchester.

CLASS VII.—Design for a Fountain for a Country Town or Village.—First prize, £20, Cyril A. Farey; second prize, £5, T. H. Morcom; prize, £5, Miss Helen Frazer Rock.

CLASS VIII.—Inexpensive Memorials for the Home.—Miss Muriel Perrin, Arthur Dix, Miss Lillian Frost, and James Guthrie (equal), £3 each; Miss Joan Kingsford, £1.

## THE EXAMINATIONS.

### Probationership R.I.B.A.

Under the Regulations published by the Council in the month of March last, the Preliminary Examination has been abolished, and instead thereof candidates for Probationership R.I.B.A. are required to produce evidence of their general education satisfactory to the Council. Particulars of the evidence required will be found in the JOURNAL for 4th March and 10th June. The Examination in Geometrical or Perspective Drawing, and in Freehand Drawing, will still be continued for those candidates who are unable to produce satisfactory evidence in the shape of drawings of an elementary knowledge of these subjects.

### The Intermediate Examination.

The Intermediate Examination, qualifying for registration as Student R.I.B.A., was held in London from the 2nd to the 9th June. Of the four candidates examined, three passed and one was relegated. The passed candidates, who have been registered as Students, are as follows, the names being given in order of merit:

WINKS: Ernest Wall [P. 1913]; 93 Bridge Street, Worksop.  
WILKINSON: Fred [P. 1916]; 162 Long Lee Terrace, Keighley.  
EDMONDSON: Thomas [P. 1913]; Brunshaw House, Burnley.

### Exemptions from the Intermediate.

The following Probationer, having produced satisfactory evidence of his training and qualifications, was exempted from sitting for the Intermediate Examination and has been registered as a Student:—

BRANDON: Charles Joseph [P. 1913]; 7 Trebovir Road, Earl's Court, S.W. [Architectural Association Schools.]

In accordance with the special concession granted by the Council to Probationers serving with the Forces who are eligible for the Intermediate Examination and whose Testimonies of Study have been approved, the following were also exempted:—

AUSTIN: Leslie Magnus [P. 1915]; 40 Wood Vale, Forest Hill, S.E. (Army Reserve.)

CLOUGH: Albert Rowland [P. 1911]; 62 Main Road, Handsworth, near Sheffield.

EVANS: Eric Ewart [P. 1911]; c/o Matthew Honan, Esq., 36 Dale Street, Liverpool. (Royal Engineers.)

FERGUSON: J. S. [P. 1916]; 14th Field Co. Engineers, 5th Australian Division, Egypt.

HUNKIN: William Burrows Clement [P. 1914]; Cae. Rhys, Ddu., Neath, Glam. (Royal Welsh Fusiliers.)

LAWRENCE: Henry Matthew [P. 1915]; 22 Marmion Street, Tamworth.

LAWSON: Edwin Maddison [P. 1915]; "Fairfield," 2 Ivanhoe Terrace, Chester-le-Street, Co. Durham. (Royal Navy.)

PILDITCH: Philip Harold [P. 1913]; Bartropp, Weybridge. (Royal Field Artillery.)

RICKATSON: John [P. 1912]; Market Place, Market Weighton, E. Yorks. (Royal Flying Corps.)

SUTCLIFFE: Thomas Wilfrid [P. 1913]; 23 Edmund Street, Rochdale. (Royal Navy.)

SYKES: Alfred Howard [P. 1913]; 90 Birkby Hall Road, Huddersfield. (Artists' Rifles.)

WEEKES: Norman Barnett [P. 1915]; c/o Liverpool Corporation Engineers Department. (Royal Engineers.)

WILSON: Reginald Alexander [P. 1914]; 259 Oxford Street, Swansea. (Highland Light Infantry.)

### The Final and Special Examinations.

The Final and Special Examinations, qualifying for candidature as Associate R.I.B.A., were held in London from the 22nd to the 30th June. Of the 20 candidates

admitted, 13 passed, and the remaining 7 were relegated in various subjects. The successful candidates are as follows:—

ARMSTRONG: John Ramsay [S. 1914]; 2 Marshall Place, Perth.  
BRANDON: Charles Joseph [S. 1916]; 7 Trebovir Road, Earl's Court, S.W.

ELGAR: Wm. Henry [S. 1911]; 48 Watkin Road, Folkestone.  
ELLISON: Robert Kitching [Special]; 13 Shaftesbury Avenue, Bedford.

FOULKES: Sidney Colwyn [Special]; Central Chambers, Colwyn Bay.

HALL: Robert Brearley [S. 1911]; Exe Vale, Letchworth.  
HOLMAN: Arthur Rowland [S. 1902]; 27 Westbourne Road, Penarth, S. Wales.

HUTTON: Lorne De Hutton [S. 1915]; 2nd Artists' Rifles, Hare Hall Camp, Romford, Essex.  
LOWRY: Robert [S. 1909]; 5 Park Road, East Twickenham.

LUYKEN: Heinrich Martin [S. 1912]; 23 Arcadian Gardens, Wood Green, N.

SPARROW: Arthur John [S. 1912]; Ingram House, Stockwell Road, S.W.

TODD: Harold Edgar [S. 1915]; Harts Cottage, Almondsbury, near Bristol.

WILSON: James Frederick [S. 1912]; 40 Upton Road, Newport, Mon.

## NOTICES.

### Subscriptions of Members serving with the Colours.

On the 31st December 1915 the Council passed a resolution to the effect that they would remit the subscriptions and contributions due 1st January 1916 of all Members and Licentiates serving with the Forces who made a written application for such remission before 1st July 1916. The Council have now resolved to extend the remission to all serving with the Forces whose applications in writing are received before 31st December 1916.

### Licentiates and the Fellowship.

The next Examination of Licentiates desiring to qualify for candidature as Fellows will take place in January, 1917. Applications for admission to the Examination must be sent in by the end of the current year.

### Employment for Architects.

Architects who are hit by the war and desirous of obtaining employment, even at a small weekly remuneration, are recommended to apply to the Hon. Secretary, Architects' War Committee, 9, Conduit Street, W.

### Contents of this Issue.

	PAGE
A History of Architecture reviewed [Reginald Blomfield, R.A.]	281
Classic Vintage [Paul Waterhouse]	285
Designs for War Memorials: Civic Arts Association Competition [A. E. Richardson]	287
On Inscriptions and War Memorials [P. A. Robson]	288
Mural Monuments and Tombstones: review of Mr. Batsford's Book [James Williams]	289
Portraits of Members fallen in the War	291
Chronicle.—R.I.B.A. Record of Honour: Thirty-second List.—Military Honours.—Immelman's Conqueror.—Charing Cross Station and Bridge.—Control of Building: Government Restrictions.—Sir Rowand Anderson and the Royal Gold Medal.—Arts and Crafts: Scheme for a Great Exhibition.—The Civic Arts Association Exhibition	290
The Examination	296

OFFICE OFFER.—An architect retiring from practice, offers his complete office furniture, library, and effects for sale. A reasonable price to clear. Apply Box 246, R.I.B.A. Journal, 9 Conduit Street, W.



